

APPLICATION NO.

10/517,033

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov		
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
7831.1019	2853	

EXAMINER

21831 7590 07/26/2006 WOLF BLOCK SCHORR AND SOLIS-COHEN LLP

FILING DATE

04/29/2005

WOLF BLOCK SCHORR AND SOLIS-COHEN LLF 250 PARK AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10177 KILKENNY, PATRICK J

PAPER NUMBER

ART UNIT

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR

Pekka Kangasniemi

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summers	10/517,033	KANGASNIEMI, PEKKA		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Patrick J. Kilkenny	3732		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).				
Status				
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>13 July 2006</u> .				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims				
 4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-12 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1 and 3-12 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 				
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12/7/2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal D 6) Other:			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 3-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riitano et al. (6,575,747). Rittano et al. discloses and a root canal instrument with a metallic needle part (24) and a substantially continuous gripping end of homogeneous structure (22). Rittano et al. also discloses that the handle be made of deformable plastic material such that the coefficient of kinetic friction is higher than that of metal (Column 16, lines 42-48). There is also an embodiment where the gripping end has a surface layer (700') and there is a layer (410) underneath the surface layer. Since Rittano et al. discloses that the file part of the instrument is made from strong resilient metal and the handle is made from deformable plastic, it is inherent that the surface layer material of handle (700') has a lower hardness than that of the underneath layer (410), since it is continuous with the metallic needle part. Rittano et al. does not disclose the ranges of coefficient of kinetic friction or Shore hardness of the layers of the gripping end that are claimed. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to manufacture the root canal

Art Unit: 3732

instrument within the specifically claimed ranges of the coefficient of kinetic friction and shore hardness, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. Furthermore, Rittano et al. discloses the fact that a plastic material is used on the handle to be deformable and have a higher coefficient of kinetic coefficient than that of metal. Therefore, a teaching exists for modify theses specific variables to obtain a handle that has the ideal hardness and coefficient of kinetic friction.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick J. Kilkenny whose telephone number is (571) 272-8684. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Rodriguez can be reached on (571) 272-4964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Patrick J. Kilkenny

Art Unit 3732 July 24, 2006

7/24/2006

PJK

Cris L. RODRIGUEZ
CRIS L. RODRIGUEZ

PRIMARY EXAMINER